



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

decided *penchant* for citing immense series of volumes which no student or teacher could think of purchasing for his own library. As might very naturally have been expected, especial prominence is given to works published in England, and this very properly indeed as being what the majority of his readers will most wish to know about.

The most important omission noticed is in the section on *Books and Manuscripts*, where no mention is made of Monaci's three collections of facsimiles, in spite of the fact that his collection of one hundred such is certainly the most available one for students of French palæography, taking into consideration both its scope and its price. On p. 22 we miss Prof. Warren's *History of the Novel*.

One of the most interesting of the opinions expressed by the author is to be found on p. 18, where we find the sentence :

"the admirable illustrated *Geschichte der französischen Litteratur*, by Suchier and Birch-Hirschfeld—is a worthy and in some points even superior, rival of Petit de Julleville's large work."

As an amusing title we may cite (p. 50) "Poiré's *French course for evening classes*."

The typography is rather poor throughout, and numerous errors of various sorts are noticeable, especially in French words.

Not even distantly approaching Prof. Koschwitz' work for advanced students, nor Prof. Rossmann's for practical work in Paris, the present book would seem to be rather better adapted as a *vademecum* for a student working in the large public libraries.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

### ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

*An Elementary Old English Reader* (Early West Saxon), edited by ALFRED J. WYATT, M. A. (Cantab. et Londin.). Cambridge: At the University Press, 1901. 171 pp.

THIS Reader forms the continuation of the same author's *Elementary Old English Grammar*, which appeared in 1897. Covering, as it does, singularly familiar ground—its texts being taken from well-known and much used

critical editions—there was little chance for display of original scholarship. In accordance with the scheme of his *Grammar*, Wyatt has confined himself entirely to Early West Saxon. Hence he had naturally to fall back on Sweet's edition of the *Orosius* and the *Cura Pastoralis*, and the Earle-Plummer text of the *Chronicles*. The selections from the latter include the major part of the Parker MS. annals up to 901 A. D.; *Orosius* is rather fully represented by nineteen selections (not omitting Olthoff's and Wulfstan's voyages); and the *Cura Pastoralis* is drawn upon for twelve chapters, in addition to Ælfred's Preface;—making in all ninety-six pages of reading matter.

It is a surprise to us that in this book, which is intended for beginners, the length of vowels has been left unmarked in the texts, only the MS. accents being given. Is the young student expected to master the quantity of vowels solely by means of the Glossary, or will he find it a pleasant task to enter the diacritical signs into the text himself? This method, in our opinion, only serves to increase the difficulties of the study. The beginner simply needs the marks of quantity; why, then, withhold them from him in an elementary book? Sweet followed a more practical course in reserving unmarked texts (from Ælfred and Ælfric) for those who had previously worked through his *Anglo-Saxon Primer and Reader*. Similarly, in the Glossary, we miss certain helps which are ordinarily supplied in books of this kind, namely the separation of compounds into their elements, the labeling of the strong verbs with their class numbers, and the occasional inclusion of inflectional forms, for example, the preterits of verbs or plurals of nouns. Hardly any etymological hints are given. Very likely, serious pedagogical reasons are responsible for this procedure; but we are strongly inclined to question its utility. We are willing to admit, however, that the actual users of the Reader may, after all, be the best judges of its practical merits.

The editor's work, as shown in the Notes and Glossary, is careful and scholarly, as in fact we had reason to expect from Mr. Wyatt. Especially the notes on the two Alfredian texts are quite welcome. A few explanations have been noticed which do not seem to the point.

33. 19. (*ond þa kyningas, ond þa oðre heahðun-gene men, swa micle leng swa hi maran speda habbað, hwilum healf gear*), *þæt hi beoð unforbærned and licgað bufan eorðan on hyra husum*. Wyatt's note reads: "*þæt* 'during which time.' Supply *licgað* in l. 18 from *lið* in l. 16." We prefer to take *þæt* as the redundant conjunction, which is by no means uncommon in the apodosis (or its equivalent); for example, *Æfter þæm þe Romeburg getimbred was iiii hunde wintrum 7 lxxx, gemong þæm oprum monegunn wundrun þe on þæm dagum gelumpan, þæt mon geseah weallan blod of eorþan 7 rinan meolc of heofonum*, Oros. 162. 4; ib. 78. 1; 154. 1; etc.; *Of þære tide Paulinus se biscop syx ger ful, þæt is oð endan þæs cyninges rices, þæt he mid his fulltome in þære mægðe Godes word bodode 7 lærde*, Bede 138. 28; etc., etc. The construction may also have been influenced by the occurrence of the conjunction *þæt* in the preceding clause: *On þær is mid Estum ðeaw, þonne þær bið man dead, þæt he lið inne unforbærned*, etc.

71. 7. *ðone naman anne we lufedon ðætte we Cristene wæren, & swiðe feawe þa ðeawas*. We do not regard Sweet's interpretation of *swiðe feawe þa ðeawas* ("very few of the virtues") as untenable. The construction is in a line with: *hie sume* 14. 20 (Wyatt's Reader); *mid sumum þam here*, 16. 30; 30, 16; *hie healse*, 41. 22; further: *mid feawum hire geferum*, Bede 332. 21; ib. 388. 7 (see variants). Cf. Wülfing, i, §374.

73. 6. *ond ðeah þa worldlecan læceas scomað þæt hi onginnun þa wunda lacnian þe hi gesion ne magon, ond huru gif hi nouðer gecnawan ne cunnon ne þa medtrymnesse ne eac þa wyrta þe ðærwið sculon*. The note: "*nouðer gecnawan ne cunnon* 'are neither acquainted nor familiar with'" is somewhat enigmatical. Certainly *gecnawan* is to be understood as infinitive used with the verb *cunnan*, just as we find *ongitan ne cunnon* in the following clause. Other examples of this combination may be seen in Wülfing, ii, §388. *nouðer* has, of course, reference to *ne þa medtrymnesse ne eac þa wyrta*, etc.

We add a couple of gleanings from the Glossary.

The lemma *æfterfylgian* is rather mislead-

ing.—For *clæn* (adj.) we should read *clæne*.—There is no need to quote an adj. *fæstend* (?) with reference to *ða fæstendan* 87. 22.—How can *belifene* (*wurdon*) 41. 23 be explained from *belifian*, w. v.? Or *plegedon* 45. 34, from *plegan*, w. v.?—*wæde* is evidently misprint for *wædl*.—Corrections of quantity: *ānforlætan*, *āwēstan*, *Frēsisc*, *rēnian*, *witnian*.

A commendable feature of the Glossary is the distinction made between the prefix "(ge)" (when it is apparently meaningless) and "ge" ("when it has assignable force, or is invariably found prefixed to a particular word").

For the benefit of the unsuspecting student it might have been pointed out, by the way, that the conclusion of the *Pastoral Care* (*Dis is nu se wæterscipe*, etc.), is meant as poetry. See Holthausen's print in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 106, 346 f.

We have little doubt that among the numerous Old English Readers now in existence this new one will be able to hold its own. It is sufficiently distinct in character and of a high grade of scholarship. Those who use it will find it a trustworthy guide.

FREDERICK KLAEBER.

University of Minnesota.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### A NOTE ON LEAR.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—It is hazardous at this late day to offer a new interpretation of that much disputed passage in *Lear* (iii, vii, 64-5), but with Mr. Furness I seek shelter under Dr. Johnson's dictum, that in a case as puzzling as this anything may be tried. Mr. Furness devotes a page of his *Variorum* to the discussion of this passage, without, it seems to me, bringing forward any convincing elucidation of Shakspeare's exact meaning. The reading of the First Folio is—

Thou should'st have said: 'Good Porter, turn the key,  
All cruels else subscribe.'

The Quartos differ only in substituting 'subscrib'd' for 'subscribe.' Retaining the Folio